

## REMARKS

The Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 5-15, 21-30, 33-37, 43, 44, 46-48 and 51-53, if rewritten in independent form, is acknowledged and appreciated. Claims 5 and 11 are presently in independent form. Accordingly, claim 5 and its dependent claims 6-10 and claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-15 are believed to be allowable in their current state. Claims 46-48 and 51-53 have been cancelled and rewritten as new independent claims 58-63, respectively. Accordingly, new claims 58-63 are now believed to be allowable. Claims 45, 49 and 50 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mazaki et al. in view of Nito et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 describes a viewing angle compensation film which has lamination layer groups that have negative birefringence layers that are laminated at a tilt. The layers are also laminated in a face-to-face relationships so that the tilts are in opposite directions of each other. These features are shown in Figs. 18A-18D and Fig. 20 of the subject application.

The Office Action states that Mazaki fails to disclose the tilt/angle requirement, but that Nito applies the missing features. Applicants respectfully submit that Nito also does not disclose or suggest the features of the angle compensation film of the invention as described above. Therefore, even if combined, they still would not disclose or suggest these features of the invention.

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hanmer et al. in view of Verrall et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because

the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the first optical compensation film which has discotic liquid crystals whose tilt angle changes in accordance with non-linear changes in the tilt of liquid crystal molecules in a region of the liquid crystal layer closer to the first substrate. The cited references also do not disclose or suggest the second optical compensation film which has a discotic liquid crystals who tilt angle changes in accordance with non-linear changes in the tilt of liquid crystal molecules in a region of the liquid crystal layer closer to the second substrate. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 16-20 with respect to the above described features of claims 16-20.

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yamahara in view of Miyashita et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 31 describes a liquid crystal display including, among other things, liquid crystals having molecules whose longitudinal directions are aligned substantially perpendicularly to surfaces of the substrates when no voltage is applied. Claim 31 also describes two polarizing elements with absorption axes that are substantially at an angle of 45° to the direction of alignment of the liquid crystal molecules when a voltage is applied to the liquid crystals. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest these features of the invention. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this rejection with respect to these features.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mazaki et al. in view of Nito et al. and Yamahara. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Yamahara also does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1

described above in traversing the rejection based on Mazaki et al. and Nito et al. Further combining Yamahara to these two references still would not disclose or suggest the above-described features of claim 1.

Claims 45, 49 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable. These claims have been canceled.

Claims 54-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Verrall et al. in view of Mazaki et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 54 and 55 describe face-delay axes or absorption axes that deviate directions which are neither parallel nor perpendicular to one side of a film. Neither of the references disclose these features of the invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection with respect to these features.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

January 23, 2004

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978  
PADOCS\1324\65392\409906.DOC